

ON ISOMETRIC STABILITY OF COMPLEMENTED SUBSPACES OF L_p

BEATA RANDRIANANTOANINA

ABSTRACT. We show that Rudin-Plotkin isometry extension theorem in L_p implies that when X and Y are isometric subspaces of L_p and p is not an even integer, $1 \leq p < \infty$, then X is complemented in L_p if and only if Y is; moreover the constants of complementation of X and Y are equal. We provide examples demonstrating that this fact fails when p is an even integer larger than 2.

1. INTRODUCTION

Complemented subspaces of Banach spaces and in particular of L_p have been intensely studied since the introduction of the notion of a Banach space. Rosenthal [R70] and others (see the survey [F95]) demonstrated that a class of complemented subspaces of L_p is isomorphically very rich. Moreover it was shown that complemented subspaces of L_p are not “isomorphically stable”, i.e. there exist pairs of isomorphic subspaces X, Y of L_p so that X is complemented and Y is not. It is even possible to take X, Y isomorphic to L_p (see [LR69, R70, B..N77, Bn81]).

In this paper we observe that complemented subspaces of L_p are “isometrically stable” when p is not an even integer. That is, we show that if X, Y are isometric subspaces of L_p ($p \neq 4, 6, \dots$) and X is complemented in L_p then Y is also complemented in L_p , moreover, the constant of complementation does not change.

This fact is a consequence of the Rudin-Plotkin isometry extension theorem in L_p , which fails when p is an even integer. We show that also the “isometric stability” of complemented subspaces fails in L_p when $p = 4, 6, \dots$, i.e. we construct isometric subspaces U_p, V_p in L_p so that V_p is complemented and U_p is not complemented in L_p .

Our construction is based on the Rosenthal’s construction of uncomplemented copy of X_p in L_p [R70] and thus we answer a question of Rosenthal formulated in [R70, Remark 1 after Proposition 5] whether or not $\widetilde{X}_{p,w}$ is isometric to a complemented subspace of L_p (no if p is not an even integer, yes if $p = 4$).

Our study is motivated by results of Dor [D75], Schechtman [S79] and Alspach [A83], who showed that if X is 1-complemented in L_p , $1 \leq p < \infty$ and Y is $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -isomorphic with X (for ε small enough, depending only on p) then Y is complemented in L_p and the constant of complementation of Y tends to 1 as ε tends to 0. We do not know whether such

an almost-isometric stability is valid for any class of complemented but not 1-complemented subspaces of L_p .

We will use standard notation and facts from Banach space theory as may be found in [LTII]. The construction of the main example in Section 3 relies heavily on Rosenthal's construction of the space X_p [R70].

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank Professors G. Schechtman and R. Pol for many valuable discussions.

2. ISOMETRIC STABILITY OF COMPLEMENTED SUBSPACES OF L_p WHEN p IS NOT AN EVEN INTEGER

We start with recalling Rudin-Plotkin isometry extension theorem [Rn76, P70, P74] (cf. also [Hn81, Ly78]).

Theorem 1. *Let $p \geq 1$, p not an even integer, and let $H \subset L_p[0, 1]$. If $T : H \longrightarrow L_p[0, 1]$ is a linear isometry, then there exists a linear isometry $\tilde{T} : L_p([0, 1], \mathcal{A}_0) \longrightarrow L_p[0, 1]$ such that $T = \tilde{T}|_H$. Here $\mathcal{A}_0$ is the smallest σ -subalgebra making all functions from the space H measurable.*

As an almost immediate consequence, we obtain:

Corollary 2. *Let $p \geq 1$, p not an even integer, and let X be a K -complemented subspace of $L_p[0, 1]$. Suppose that $Y \subset L_p[0, 1]$ is isometric with X . Then Y is K -complemented in $L_p[0, 1]$.*

Proof. Let $T : Y \longrightarrow X$ denote the isometry between X and Y . Then by Theorem 1, there exists an extension of T ,

$$\tilde{T} : L_p([0, 1], \mathcal{A}_0) \longrightarrow L_p[0, 1]$$

so that $\|\tilde{T}\| = 1$ and $\tilde{T}|_Y = T$, where $\mathcal{A}_0$ is the smallest σ -subalgebra, making all functions from Y measurable. By [An66], there exists a contractive projection $P_1 : L_p[0, 1] \longrightarrow L_p([0, 1], \mathcal{A}_0)$. Let P denote the projection $P : L_p[0, 1] \longrightarrow X$.

Define $Q : L_p[0, 1] \longrightarrow Y$ by

$$Q = T^{-1}P\tilde{T}P_1.$$

Then, for every $y \in Y$,

$$Qy = T^{-1}P\tilde{T}P_1y = T^{-1}P\tilde{T}y = T^{-1}P(Ty) = T^{-1}(Ty) = y$$

so Q is a projection, and $\|Q\| \leq \|T^{-1}\| \cdot \|P\| \cdot \|\tilde{T}\| \cdot \|P_1\| = \|P\|$. □

Theorem 1 is not true when p is an even integer ($p \neq 2$), and also, Corollary 2 fails for $p = 4, 6, \dots$. The next section is devoted to the construction of the example.

3. EXAMPLE

In this section, we will show that if p is an even integer greater than 2 then Theorem 2 fails in L_p , i.e. we will show that there exist subspaces $V_p, U_p \subset L_p$ such that V_p and U_p are isometric, V_p is complemented in L_p , and U_p is not complemented in L_p .

Our construction is somewhat long and will be divided into several lemmas.

First we observe that when p is an even integer, say $p = 2k$, then the p -norm of the sum of independent symmetric random variables is determined by the norms of the summands. Namely we have:

Lemma 3. *Suppose that $p = 2k$, $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^n$ are independent symmetric random variables and let $f = \sum_{j=1}^n f_j$. Then $\|f\|_p$ depends only on the values of $(\|f_j\|_{2m})_{m=1, j=1}^k$.*

Namely we have

$$\|f\|_p^p = \sum_{k_1+\dots+k_n=k} \binom{2k}{2k_1} \binom{2(k-k_1)}{2k_2} \cdots \binom{2(k-k_1-\dots-k_{n-1})}{2k_n} \prod_{j=1}^n \|f_j\|_{2k_j}^{2k_j}.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_p^p &= \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^n f_j \right)^{2k} \\ &= \int_0^1 \sum_{k_1+\dots+k_n=2k} \binom{2k}{k_1} \binom{2k-k_1}{k_2} \cdots \binom{k_n}{k_n} \cdot f_1^{k_1} \cdot f_2^{k_2} \cdots f_n^{k_n} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \sum_{k_1+\dots+k_n=2k} \binom{2k}{k_1} \cdots \binom{k_n}{k_n} \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\int_0^1 f_j^{k_j} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(**)}{=} \sum_{k_1+\dots+k_n=k} \binom{2k}{2k_1} \cdots \binom{2k_n}{2k_n} \prod_{j=1}^n \int f_j^{2k_j} \\ &= \sum_{k_1+\dots+k_n=k} \binom{2k}{2k_1} \cdots \binom{2k_n}{2k_n} \prod_{j=1}^n \|f_j\|_{2k_j}^{2k_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, equality $(*)$ holds by independence of f_j 's and $(**)$ holds by symmetry of f_j 's, and we use a convention that $\|f_j\|_0^0 = 1$. $\square$

Notice that when $p = 4$, Lemma 3 implies:

Corollary 4. *The uncomplemented subspace Y_4 of L_4 built in [R70, Corollary after Proposition 5] is isometric to a certain complemented subspace of L_4 spanned by 3-valued independent symmetric random variables.*

Proof. Let $g_1, g_2, \dots$ be a sequence of independent symmetric $\{+1, -1, 0\}$ -valued random variables defined by Rosenthal in [R70, Corollary after Proposition 5], that is, $\int |g_{2n-2}| =$

1 and $\int |g_{2n-3}| = (n \log^2 n)^{-1}$ for all $n \geq 2$. Let $f_{n-1} = g_{2n-3} + n^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_{2n-2}$ and $Y_4 = \text{span}\{f_{n-1}\} \subset L_4$.

Then, by Lemma 3,

$$\|f_{n-1}\|_2^2 = \|g_{2n-3}\|_2^2 + \|n^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_{2n-2}\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{n \log^2 n} + \frac{1}{n}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{n-1}\|_4^4 &= \|g_{2n-3}\|_4^4 + 2\|g_{2n-3}\|_2^2 \|n^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_{2n-2}\|_2^2 + \|n^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_{2n-2}\|_4^4 = \\ &= \frac{1}{n \log^2 n} + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{n \log^2 n} \cdot \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n^2} \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} a_n &= \left(\frac{n + 2 + \log^2 n}{n(1 + \log^2 n)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \nu_n &= \frac{1 + 2 \log^2 n + \log^4 n}{n \log^2 n + 2 \log^2 n + \log^4 n} \quad \text{for } n \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Let h_n be $\{1, 0, -1\}$ -valued symmetric independent random variables with $\int |h_{n-1}| = \nu_n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|a_n h_{n-1}\|_2^2 &= a_n^2 \nu_n = \|f_{n-1}\|_2^2 \\ \|a_n h_{n-1}\|_4^4 &= a_n^4 \nu_n = \|f_{n-1}\|_4^4. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 3, $Z_4 = \text{span}\{a_n h_{n-1}\} \subset L_4$ is isometric with $Y_4 = \text{span}\{f_{n-1}\} \subset L_4$.

By [R70, Theorem 4], Z_4 is complemented in L_4 , and by [R70, Corollary after Proposition 5], Y_4 is not complemented in L_4 . $\square$

When p is an even integer larger than 4, our construction becomes more complicated, but it is also modeled on [R70, Corollary after Proposition 5].

We will construct subspaces $U_p, V_p \subset L_p$ as spans of certain sequences of independent symmetric random variables. V_p will not be spanned by 3-valued random variables as in the case of $p = 4$, but it will be complemented in L_p by a slight modification of the argument in [R70, Theorem 4]. U_p will be uncomplemented and very similar to the space Y_p from [R70, Corollary after Proposition 5].

We will show that U_p and V_p are isometric by showing that the $2m$ -norms of generators of U_p and V_p are the same for all $m = 1, \dots, k$, and by applying Lemma 3.

Consider independent random variables $\{g_{j,i}\}_{i=1, j=1}^{k=1, \infty}$ which are symmetric $\{+1, -1, 0\}$ -valued, and such that $\int |g_{j,i}|$ does not depend on j when $1 \leq i \leq k$, say $\int |g_{j,i}| = \mu_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and denote $\int |g_{j,k+1}| = \nu_j$.

Define $h_j = \sum_{i=1}^k g_{j,i}$.

Lemma 5. For $m, 1 \leq m \leq k, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|h_j\|_{2m}^{2m} = H_m(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$, where H_m is defined by

$$H_m(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^m \sum_{\substack{S \subset \{1, \dots, k\} \\ \text{card } S = \alpha}} \left[C_{m, \alpha} \left(\prod_{i \in S} \mu_i \right) \right],$$

where $C_{m, \alpha} = \sum_{m_1 + \dots + m_\alpha = m - \alpha} \binom{2m}{2(m_1+1)} \binom{2(m-(m_1+1))}{2(m_2+1)} \dots \binom{2(m_\alpha+1)}{2(m_\alpha+1)}$ is a constant independent of $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k$.

Proof. By Lemma 3, $\|h_j\|_{2m}$ depends only on $(\|g_{ji}\|_{2l}^{2l})_{i=1}^k$. Moreover by (3) we have, since $\|g_{ji}\|_{2l}^{2l} = \mu_i$ whenever $l > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_j\|_{2m}^{2m} &= \sum_{m_1 + \dots + m_k = m} \binom{2m}{2m_1} \binom{2(m-m_1)}{2m_2} \dots \binom{2m_k}{2m_k} \prod_{i=1}^k \|g_{ji}\|_{2m_i}^{2m_i} \\ &= \sum_{m_1 + \dots + m_k = m} \binom{2m}{2m_1} \dots \binom{2m_k}{2m_k} \prod_{i=1}^k \mu_i^{\text{sgn}(m_i)} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^m \sum_{\substack{S \subset \{1, \dots, k\} \\ \text{card } S = \alpha}} \left(\prod_{i \in S} \mu_i \right) \cdot \left[\sum_{m_1 + \dots + m_\alpha = m - \alpha} \binom{2m}{2(m_1+1)} \binom{2(m-(m_1+1))}{2(m_2+1)} \dots \binom{2m_\alpha}{2m_\alpha} \right] \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^m \sum_{\substack{S \subset \{1, \dots, k\} \\ \text{card } S = \alpha}} C_{m, \alpha} \left(\prod_{i \in S} \mu_i \right) \\ &= H_m(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k). \end{aligned}$$

□

Next, define $f_j = h_j + jg_{j,k+1}$

Lemma 6. For $m, 1 \leq m \leq k, j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\|f_j\|_{2m}^{2m} = F_m^{(j)}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j)$, where $F_m^{(j)}$ is defined by

$$F_m^{(j)}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j) = H_m(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k) + \nu_j \sum_{l=1}^m \binom{2m}{2l} j^{2l} H_{m-l}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$$

Proof. We again use (3) to get:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_j\|_{2m}^{2m} &= \|h_j + jg_{j,k+1}\|_{2m}^{2m} \\ &= \sum_{m_1 + m_2 = 2m} \binom{2m}{2m_1} \binom{2m_2}{2m_2} \|h_j\|_{2m_1}^{2m_1} \|jg_{j,k+1}\|_{2m_2}^{2m_2} \\ &= \|h_j\|_{2m}^{2m} + \sum_{l=1}^m \binom{2m}{2(m-l)} \binom{2l}{2l} \|h_j\|_{2(m-l)}^{2(m-l)} \cdot j^{2l} \|g_{j,k+1}\|_{2l}^{2l} \\ &= \|h_j\|_{2m}^{2m} + \nu_j \sum_{l=1}^m \binom{2m}{2l} j^{2l} \|h_j\|_{2(m-l)}^{2(m-l)} \\ &= F_m^{(j)}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j). \end{aligned}$$

□

Our next goal is to show that it is possible to choose $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k$ and $\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_k, \tilde{\nu}_j$ so that $H_m(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k) = F_m^{(j)}(\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_k, \tilde{\nu}_j)$ for all $m = 1, \dots, k, j \in \mathbb{N}$, and, consequently, so that $V_p = \text{span}\{h_j\}$ and $U_p = \text{span}\{\tilde{f}_j\}$ are isometric.

For that, fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and define $F^{(j)} : \mathbb{R}^{k+1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ by:

$$F^{(j)}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j) = \left(F_m^{(j)}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j) \right)_{m=1}^k.$$

First we will need:

Lemma 7. *When $\mu_1 > \mu_2 > \dots > \mu_k > 0$ then for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{rank } F^{(j)} = k$ at the point $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6 for all $m, 1 \leq m \leq k$

$$\left. \frac{\partial F_m^{(j)}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \right|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j)} = \left. \frac{\partial H_m}{\partial \mu_\beta} \right|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} + \nu_j \sum_{l=1}^m \binom{2m}{2l} j^{2l} \cdot \left. \frac{\partial H_{m-l}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \right|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)}. \quad (1)$$

Thus

$$\left. \frac{\partial F_m^{(j)}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \right|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0)} = \left. \frac{\partial H_m}{\partial \mu_\beta} \right|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)}$$

By Lemma 5 we get, that, with a convention $\prod_{i \in \emptyset} \mu_i = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial H_m}{\partial \mu_\beta} \right|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^m \sum_{\substack{S \subset \{1, \dots, k\} \\ \text{card } S = \alpha \\ \beta \in S}} \left[C_{m, \alpha} \left(\prod_{i \in S \setminus \{\beta\}} \mu_i \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^m C_{m, \alpha} \left(\sum_{\substack{S \subset \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{\beta\} \\ \text{card } S = \alpha - 1}} \left(\prod_{i \in S} \mu_i \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

To simplify equation (2) we will need the following notation: for any $\alpha, \beta : 0 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq k$, let

$$\begin{aligned} P_\alpha &= \sum_{\substack{S \subset \{1, \dots, k\} \\ \text{card } S = \alpha}} \left(\prod_{i \in S} \mu_i \right) \\ P_{\beta, \alpha} &= \sum_{\substack{S \subset \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{\beta\} \\ \text{card } S = \alpha}} \left(\prod_{i \in S} \mu_i \right) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $P_0 = P_{\beta,0} = 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\beta,\alpha} &= P_\alpha - \mu_\beta \sum_{\substack{S \subset \{1,\dots,k\} \setminus \{\beta\} \\ \text{card } S = \alpha-1}} \left(\prod_{i \in S} \mu_i \right) = P_\alpha - \mu_\beta P_{\beta,\alpha-1} \\
&= P_\alpha - \mu_\beta P_{\alpha-1} + \mu_\beta^2 P_{\beta,\alpha-2} \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^{\alpha} (-1)^t \mu_\beta^t P_{\alpha-t} .
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore equation (2) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left. \frac{\partial H_m}{\partial \mu_\beta} \right|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^m C_{m,\alpha} P_{\beta,\alpha-1} \\
&= \sum_{\alpha=1}^m C_{m,\alpha} \sum_{t=0}^{\alpha-1} (-1)^t \mu_\beta^t P_{\alpha-t-1} .
\end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left. \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \mu_\beta} \right|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} &= C_{1,1} \\
\left. \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \mu_\beta} \right|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} &= C_{2,1} + C_{2,2} (P_1 - \mu_\beta) \\
\left. \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \mu_\beta} \right|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} &= C_{3,1} + C_{3,2} (P_2 - \mu_\beta P_1 + \mu_\beta^2) .
\end{aligned}$$

and so on.

Thus the first row of the matrix of the derivative can be reduced to the row of ones $(1, \dots, 1)$. Using the first row we can reduce the second row to the form $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_k)$. Similarly, using the first two rows we reduce the third row to $(\mu_1^2, \mu_2^2, \dots, \mu_k^2)$ and so on.

Thus the matrix of the derivative for $F^{(j)}$ at $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$ reduces to the Vandermonde matrix

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \cdots & \mu_k \\ \vdots & & & \\ \mu_1^{k-1} & \mu_2^{k-1} & \cdots & \mu_k^{k-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

Since $\mu_1 > \mu_2 > \dots > \mu_k > 0$, $\det V \neq 0$ (see for example [HJ]) and therefore Jacobian of $F^{(j)}$ at $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$ is nonzero, that is $\text{rank } F^{(j)}$ is maximal at the point $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$. $\square$

Next we want to show that $\text{rank } F^{(j)}$ is maximal in some large enough open set.

Lemma 8. *There exist $(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{rank } F^{(j)} = k$ at every point $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j) \in B_\infty((\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, 0), \varepsilon_0 j^{2-p})$ (here $B_\infty(x, r)$ denotes the ball with center x and radius r in $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ with the ℓ_∞ -norm).*

Proof. Fix some $(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k)$ with $\bar{\mu}_1 > \bar{\mu}_2 > \dots > \bar{\mu}_k > 0$, (for example $\bar{\mu}_i = \frac{i}{k}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$) and let $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ be such that $\bar{\varepsilon} < \frac{1}{2} \min\{(\bar{\mu}_i - \bar{\mu}_{i+1}), \mu_k : i = 1, \dots, k-1\}$. Then, by Lemma 7,

$$\det \left[\left(\frac{\partial F_m^{(j)}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \right) \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0)} \right]_{m=1, \beta=1}^k \neq 0$$

for all $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0) \in B_\infty((\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, 0), \bar{\varepsilon})$.

Since the determinant is a continuous function of entries of a matrix there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{if } \max_{1 \leq m, \beta \leq k} \left| a_{m\beta} - \frac{\partial F_m^{(j)}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0)} \right| < \varepsilon \text{ for some } (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0) \in B_\infty((\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, 0), \bar{\varepsilon}) , \\ & \text{then } \det \left((a_{m\beta})_{m=1, \beta=1}^k \right) \neq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Set

$$M = \sup \left\{ \left(\frac{2m}{2l} \right) \left| \frac{\partial H_{m-l}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \right|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} : (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0) \in B_\infty((\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, 0), \bar{\varepsilon}), 1 \leq \beta, m, l \leq k \right\}$$

and let

$$|\nu_j| < \frac{\varepsilon}{M(k-1)j^{2(k-1)}} \quad (4)$$

Then, by (1)

$$\left| \frac{\partial F_m^{(j)}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j)} - \frac{\partial F_m^{(j)}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0)} \right| = \left| \nu_j \sum_{l=1}^m \left(\frac{2m}{2l} \right) j^{2l} \frac{\partial H_{m-l}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} \right| < \varepsilon$$

when $m = 1, \dots, k-1$ and $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0) \in B_\infty(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\varepsilon})$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(\frac{\partial F_k^{(j)}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j)} - \nu_j \left(\frac{2k}{2k} \right) j^{2k} \frac{\partial H_0}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} \right) - \frac{\partial F_k^{(j)}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0)} \right| \\ & = \left| \nu_j \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \left(\frac{2k}{2l} \right) j^{2l} \frac{\partial H_{k-l}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} \right| < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we define for $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$, when $m = 1, \dots, k-1, \beta = 1, \dots, k$

$$a_{m\beta}(\mu) = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial F_m^{(j)}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j)} & \text{when } m = 1, \dots, k-1, \beta = 1, \dots, k \\ \frac{\partial F_k^{(j)}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j)} - \nu_j j^{2k} & \text{when } m = k, \beta = 1, \dots, k \end{cases}$$

then, by (3) $\det((a_{m\beta}(\mu))) \neq 0$.

Further, define

$$b_{m\beta}(\mu) = \begin{cases} a_{m\beta}(\mu), & \text{when } m = 1, \dots, k-1, \beta = 1, \dots, k \\ \nu_j j^{2k}, & \text{when } m = k, \beta = 1, \dots, k. \end{cases}$$

Then, for all $\beta = 1, \dots, k$; we have

$$\begin{aligned} b_{1\beta}(\mu) &= \frac{\partial F_1^{(j)}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j)} = \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} + \nu_j j^2 \frac{\partial H_0}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} \\ &= C_{1,1} + \nu_j j^2 = \frac{C_{1,1} + \nu_j j^2}{\nu_j j^{2k}} \cdot b_{k\beta}(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\det(b_{m\beta}(\mu)) = 0$.

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det \left(\left(\frac{\partial F_m^{(j)}}{\partial \mu_\beta} \Big|_{(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j)} \right)_{m, \beta} \right) &= \det((a_{m\beta}(\mu))) + \det((b_{m\beta}(\mu))) \\ &= \det((a_{m\beta}(\mu))) \neq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

and (5) holds for all $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k$ with $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, 0) \in B_\infty((\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, 0), \bar{\varepsilon})$ and all ν_j satisfying (4), that is (5) hold for all $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \nu_j) \in B_\infty((\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, 0), \delta_j)$ where $\delta_j = \frac{\varepsilon}{M(k-1)} j^{2-2k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon_0 j^{2-p}$. $\square$

Now we are ready to construct isometric subspaces V_p and U_p of L_p as indicated before Lemma 7.

Proposition 9. *There exist $\bar{\mu}_1 > \dots > \bar{\mu}_k > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\mu_1^{(j)} > \dots > \mu_k^{(j)} > \delta > 0$ and ν_j with $\frac{\delta}{2} j^{2-p} < \nu_j < \delta j^{2-p}$ so that*

$$F_m^{(j)}(\mu_1^{(j)}, \dots, \mu_k^{(j)}, \nu_j) = H_m(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k)$$

for all $m = 1, \dots, k$.

Proof. Proposition 9 is an immediate consequence of Lemma 8 and the general theory of multivariable maps whose derivatives are surjective. Namely we will use the following:

Preimage Theorem. (see e.g. [GP, p.21]). *Let X, Y be manifolds with $\dim X \geq \dim Y$, $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and $y \in f(X)$ be a value such that the derivative of f at every point $x \in X$ with $f(x) = y$ is surjective. Then the preimage $f^{-1}(y)$ is a submanifold of X with $\dim f^{-1}(y) = \dim X - \dim Y$.*

Indeed, for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the function $F^{(j)} \Big|_{B_\infty((\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, 0), \varepsilon_0 j^{2-p})}$, where $\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, \varepsilon_0$ are the numbers guaranteed by Lemma 8. Then, by Lemma 8, the derivative of $F^{(j)}$ at every point of $B_\infty((\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, 0), \varepsilon_0 j^{2-p})$ is surjective.

In particular $y = F^{(j)}(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, 0)$ satisfies the assumptions of the Preimage Theorem, and thus $f^{-1}(y)$ is a submanifold of $B_\infty((\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, 0), \varepsilon_0 j^{2-p})$ with $\dim f^{-1}(y) = (k+1) - k = 1$. Thus, to satisfy conclusions of Proposition 9, it is enough to take $\delta = \min(\varepsilon_0, \bar{\mu}_k - \varepsilon_0)$ (recall that for all $m = 1, \dots, k$, $F_m^{(j)}(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k, 0) = H_m(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k)$). $\square$

Corollary 10. *Let $\bar{\mu}_i, \mu_i^{(j)}, \nu_j$, $i = 1, \dots, k, j \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfy conditions of Proposition 9 and let $g_{j,i}, \tilde{g}_{j,i}$ be such that $\int |g_{j,i}| = \mu_i$, $\int |\tilde{g}_{j,i}| = \mu_i^{(j)}$, $\int |\tilde{g}_{j,k+1}| = \nu_j$.*

Define $V_p = \text{span}\{h_j = \sum_{i=1}^k g_{j,i}\} \subset L_p$ and $U_p = \text{span}\{f_j = \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{g}_{j,i} + j\tilde{g}_{j,k+1}\} \subset L_p$. Then U_p and V_p are isometric.

Proof. Corollary 10 follows from Lemma 3, 5, 6 and Proposition 9. $\square$

Our next goal is to establish that V_p is complemented and U_p is not complemented in L_p .

The proof that V_p is complemented in L_p is essentially the same as the proof that linear span of independent symmetric 3-valued random variables is complemented in L_p [R70, Theorem 4]. The only difference is that in the case of 3-valued random variables $\|f\|_p \cdot \|f\|_q \leq \|f\|_2^2$ and in the case of our generating random variables h_j there exists some larger constant $C = C(p)$ so that $\|h_j\|_p \cdot \|h_j\|_q \leq C \cdot \|h_j\|_2^2$.

For the convenience of the reader we provide the proof (with only one change from the original).

Lemma 11. *(cf. [R70, Theorem 4]). Let $2 < p < \infty$ and let $h_1, h_2, \dots$ be an infinite sequence of independent symmetric random variables so that there exists C with*

$$\|h_j\|_p \cdot \|h_j\|_q \leq C \|h_j\|_2^2$$

for all j . Then $V_p = \text{span}\{h_j\}$ is complemented in L_p .

Proof. Following Rosenthal, we define P to be the restriction to L_p , of the orthogonal projection from L_2 onto V_2 , regarding $L_p \subset L_2$. Thus $P : L_p \rightarrow L_2$ is given by

$$P(f) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\int_0^1 f(x) \frac{h_n(x) \|h_n\|_p}{\|h_n\|_2^2} dx \right) \frac{h_n}{\|h_n\|_p}$$

for all $f \in L_p$. Now fix $f \in L_p$ and put

$$x_n = \left(\int_0^1 f(x) h_n(x) dx \right) \frac{\|h_n\|_p}{\|h_n\|_2^2} \quad \text{for all } n.$$

Then

$$\left(\sum |x_n|^2 w_n^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left(\sum |x_n|^2 \frac{\|h_n\|_p^2}{\|h_n\|_2^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \|Pf\|_2 \leq \|f\|_2 \leq \|f\|_p.$$

Now let n be fixed and let $c_1, \dots, c_n$ be such that $\sum_{j=1}^n |c_j|^q \leq 1$. Then

$$\|c_j h_j\|_q \|c_j h_j\|_p \leq C |c_j| \|h_j\|_2^2$$

and [R70, Lemma 2(b) and the remarks following it] imply that:

$$\left\| \sum c_j \frac{h_j \|h_j\|_p}{\|h_j\|_2^2} \right\|_q^q \leq C^q \sum |c_j|^q \leq C^q.$$

Thus

$$\left| \sum c_j x_j \right| = \left| \int_0^1 f(x) \left(\sum c_j \frac{h_j \|h_j\|_p}{\|h_j\|_2^2} \right) dx \right| \leq C \|f\|_p$$

Hence since n and $c_1, \dots, c_n$ were arbitrary satisfying $\sum |c_j|^q \leq 1$ we have:

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |x_j|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C \|f\|_p.$$

Thus (x_j) belongs to $X_{p,w}$ and $\|(x_j)\| \leq C \|f\|_p$. Hence by [R70, Theorem 3 and remarks following it], $Pf = \sum x_j f_j$ belongs to V_p and $\|Pf\|_p \leq C \cdot K_p \|f\|_p$, where K_p is the constant from Rosenthal's inequality [R70, Theorem 3]. $\square$

To finish the proof of complementability of V_p we need one more:

Lemma 12. *When p is an even integer ($p = 2k$) then there exists $C = C(p)$ so that*

$$\|h_j\|_p \cdot \|h_j\|_q \leq C \|h_j\|_2^2$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. By [R70, Lemma 2 and Remark 1 after it] we have

$$\|h_j\|_q = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k g_{j,i} \right\|_q \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \int |g_{j,i}|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{\mu}_i \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

By Lemma 5

$$\|h_j\|_2^2 = H_1(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k) = C_{1,1} \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{\mu}_i = \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{\mu}_i$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_j\|_p^p &= H_k(\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_k) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^k \sum_{\substack{S \subset \{1, \dots, k\} \\ \text{card } S = \alpha}} \left[C_{k,\alpha} \left(\prod_{i \in S} \bar{\mu}_i \right) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \sum_{\alpha=1}^k \sum_{\substack{S \subset \{1, \dots, k\} \\ \text{card } S = \alpha}} C_{k,\alpha} \bar{\mu}_1 = \bar{\mu}_1 \cdot \sum_{\alpha=1}^k \binom{k}{\alpha} C_{k,\alpha} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bar{\mu}_1 \cdot C_k. \end{aligned}$$

where inequality $(*)$ is valid since $1 > \bar{\mu}_1 > \dots > \bar{\mu}_k > 0$ and so, for every $S \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$, $\prod_{i \in S} \bar{\mu}_i \leq \bar{\mu}_1$.

Thus we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|h_j\|_q \cdot \|h_j\|_p &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{\mu}_i \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \cdot \bar{\mu}_1^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot C_k^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{\mu}_i \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{\mu}_i \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot C_k^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{\mu}_i \right) \cdot C_k^{\frac{1}{p}} = C_k^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \|h_j\|_2^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

□

Thus from Lemma 11 and 12 we obtain:

Corollary 13. V_p is complemented in L_p .

Remark . Notice that the constant $C(p)$ in Lemma 12 goes to infinity very fast when p goes to infinity. Thus the constant of complementation of V_p could be very large for large p . We do not know if it is possible to construct spaces U_p and V_p in such a way that constant of complementation of V_p is bounded independently of p .

Our last step is to prove that:

Lemma 14. Assume that p is an even integer and $p \geq 6$. Then U_p is not complemented in L_p .

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of [R70, Theorem 9] (cf. also [E70]).

Indeed we have

$$\left(\int |\tilde{g}_{j,i}| \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2p}} = \left(\mu_i^{(j)} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2p}} > \delta^{\frac{p-2}{2p}}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, k$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\left(\int |\tilde{g}_{j,k+1}| \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2p}} \right)^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \nu_j < \frac{2}{\delta} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{2-p} < \infty$$

since $p \geq 4$.

Thus, by [R70, Theorem 4 and remarks on page 283], $Z_p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{span}\{\tilde{g}_{j,i} : i = 1, \dots, k+1, j \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset L_p$ is isomorphic to $\ell_p \oplus \ell_2$.

Next set $w_j = 1/(\nu_j^{\frac{1}{p}} j)$. By Proposition 9, $\frac{\delta}{2} j^{2-p} < \nu_j < \delta j^{2-p}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} j^{-\frac{2}{p}} &< w_j < \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} j^{-\frac{2}{p}}, \\
\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} w_j &= 0, \\
\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} w_j^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} &> \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{\frac{-4}{p-2}} \geq \infty ,
\end{aligned}$$

since $p \geq 6$.

Thus, by [R70, Theorem 9], $\widetilde{\widetilde{X}}_{p,w} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{span} \left\{ e_j + w_j \sum_{i=1}^k b_{(j-1)k+i} \right\}$ is not a continuous linear image of $\ell_p \oplus \ell_2$ (here $(e_j), (b_j)$ denote unit vector bases in ℓ_p and ℓ_2 , resp.) and we conclude that U_p is uncomplemented in Z_p and consequently in L_p . $\square$

Remark . In the case when $p = 4$ Lemma 8 can be extended to say that $\text{rank} F^{(j)} = 2$ at every point (μ_1, μ_2, ν_j) such that $\mu_1 > \mu_2 > 0$ and $\nu_j > -\frac{1}{j^2}$. Therefore also Proposition 9 can be satisfied with ν_j arbitrarily large when $p = 4$; in particular there exists ν_j with

$$\frac{\delta}{2} j^{-\frac{3}{2}} < \nu_j < \delta j^{-\frac{3}{2}}$$

satisfying all other conclusions of Proposition 9 and consequently also those of Corollary 10. When ν_j is of this order of magnitude it is not difficult to check that U_4 is uncomplemented in L_4 (similarly to the proof of Lemma 14), however we felt that it is much simpler to rely on the illustrative Corollary 4 for the case $p = 4$, and we leave the details of the above mentioned computations to the interested reader.

REFERENCES

- [A83] D. E. Alspach. Small into isomorphisms on L_p -spaces. *Illinois J. Math.*, 27:300–314, 1983.
- [An66] T. Ando. Contractive projections in L_p -spaces. *Pacific J. Math.*, 17:391–405, 1966.
- [B..N77] G. Bennett, L. E. Dor, V. Goodman, W. B. Johnson, and C. M. Newman. On uncomplemented subspaces of L_p , $1 < p < 2$. *Israel J. Math.*, 26:178–187, 1977.
- [Bn81] J. Bourgain. A counterexample to a complementation problem. *Compositio Math.*, 43:133–144, 1981.
- [D75] L. E. Dor. On projections in L_1 . *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 102:463–474, 1975.
- [E70] I.S. Edelstein. On complemented subspaces and unconditional bases in $\ell_p \oplus \ell_2$. *Teoria Funkcii, Functional. Anal. i Priloz.*, 10:132–143, 1970.
- [F95] G. M. Force. *Constructions of $\mathcal{L}_p$ spaces for $p \in (1, \infty) \setminus \{2\}$* . Doctor of Education Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1995. available on the Banach Space Bulletin Board at <http://www.math.okstate.edu/~alspach/banach/> filename: forcescriptLp.tex.
- [GP] V. Guillemin and A. Pollack. *Differential Topology*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1974.
- [Hn81] C. D. Hardin. Isometries on subspaces of L^p . *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 30:449–465, 1981.
- [HJ] R. A. Horn and Ch. A. Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London, New York, 1985.
- [LR69] J. Lindenstrauss and H. P. Rosenthal. Automorphisms in c_0 , ℓ_1 and m . *Israel J. Math.*, 7:227–239, 1969.
- [LTII] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri. *Classical Banach spaces, Vol. 2, Function spaces*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1979.
- [Ly78] W. Lusky. Some consequences of Rudin’s paper “ L_p -isometries and equimeasurability”. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 27:859–866, 1978.

- [P70] A. I. Plotkin. On isometric operators on subspaces of L^p . *Dokl. Acad. Nauk. SSSR*, 193:537–539, 1970.
- [P74] A. I. Plotkin. Continuation of L^p -isometries. *J. Soviet Math.*, 2:143–165, 1974.
- [R70] H. P. Rosenthal. On the subspaces of $L^p(p > 2)$ spanned by sequences of independent random variables. *Israel J. Math.*, 8:273–303, 1970.
- [Rn76] W. Rudin. L^p -isometries and equimeasurability. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 25:215–228, 1976.
- [S79] G. Schechtman. Almost isometric L_p subspaces of $L_p(0, 1)$. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 20:516–528, 1979.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MIAMI UNIVERSITY, OXFORD, OH 45056
E-mail address: `randrib@muohio.edu`